



FINAL DETERMINATION

IN THE MATTER OF

**ALLEN SHULTZ,
Requester**

v.

**FRANKLIN COUNTY,
Respondent**

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No.: AP 2026-2222

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On April 27, 2026, Allen Shultz (“Requester”) submitted a two Requests (“Requests”) to Franklin County (“County”) pursuant to the Right-to-Know Law (“RTKL”), 65 P.S. §§ 67.101 *et seq.* The substance of both Requests is attached to this Final Determination as Attachment A.

On May 4, 2026, the County issued a thirty-day extension during which to respond, 65 P.S. § 67.902(b); however, as the County did not respond within the extension period, the Request was deemed denied on June 3, 2026. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.902(b)(2). On June 4, 2026, the County issued a denial to the Request, arguing that the Request sought records of judicial agencies, specifically the Franklin County Domestic Relations Section (“DRS”), that records of judicial agencies are not records of the County, and that any records that the County may possess in relation to DRS or Title IV-D matter are not accessible through a RTKL request submitted to the County.

On June 5, 2026, the Requester appealed the County’s denial of responsive records to the Office of Open Records (“OOR”). The OOR invited both parties to supplement the record and

directed the County to notify the OOR if any third parties have a direct interest in the appeal. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(c).

On June 18, 2026, the County submitted a verified position statement arguing that given the context and prefatory statements in the Requests, the County interpreted the Requests as seeking records of the County DRS. The County claims that the records responsive to the Request are not records of the County, but are records of a judicial agency. In support of its position, the County submitted the attestation of Becky Brackbill, the Open Records Officer (“AORO”) for the County (“Brackbill Attestation”), which states in relevant part:

3. On or about April 27, 2026, I received Mr. Shultz’ requests made pursuant to the Right to Know Law. The requests were transmitted in a packet of five documents plus a certificate of service entitled:
 - a. Motion for Production of Administrative Records, Financial Analysis and Memorandum in Support.
 - b. Exhibit A-Right to Know Request Attachment (77 Items).
 - c. Exhibit B-Supplemental Right-To-Know Request #2: PcoRP Insurance Coverage, Employee/Contractor Classification, Liability Bonds, and Claims Data (42 Items).
 - d. Formal Notice to Pennsylvania Counties Risk Pool (PcoRP).
 - e. Motion for Declaratory Judgment, Injunctive Relief, and RICO Sanctions Against Judge Jeremiah D. Zook-Catalogue of Violations: November 2022 through August 2024- “Rambling”→ “Disorganized”→ “Gobbledygook”.
 - f. Master Certificate of Service.
4. Upon receipt of the request, I conducted a thorough examination of files in the possession, custody and control of the County, and have inquired with relevant County personnel with regard to said records.
5. The Court of Common Pleas for the Thirty-Ninth Judicial District (the “Court of Common Pleas”) maintains an independent Office of Open Records and Open Records Officer which is entirely separate from the County of Franklin.
6. The Open Records Officer for the Court of Common Pleas is Rebekah Reigner, Court Administrator.
7. Every one of Requester’s requests is directly related to the Courts through the Domestic Relations Section and/or the Title IV-D program, both of which are administered exclusively by the Court of Common Pleas.

8. The County has no role in the supervision of the Domestic Relations Section.
9. The County does not administer the Title IV-D program.
10. Upon receipt of Requester's requests, I determined that all of the records requested were records of a judicial agency. As such, Requester's requests were forwarded to Ms. Reigner as the Court of Common Pleas' Open Records Officer on April 27, 2026.
11. Pursuant to applicable law, the Requester is not able to access a judicial agency's records through requests directed to the County.
12. With respect to Section G, Request 30 of Exhibit B involving statements and opinions of the County solicitor regarding the categorization of individuals as "employees" or "independent contractors," after examination of the records maintained by the County as set forth above, there are no records responsive to this request.

See Brackbill Attestation ¶¶ 3-12. On June 23, 2026, the Requester submitted over 150 pages of evidence and argument alleging fraud, breach of contract, violations of various state and federal laws.¹ On June 30, 2026, the OOR sought clarification from the Requester as to the scope of the appeal and the Requester clarified that he challenges the denial of all 111 subparts of the Requests. The Requester submitted further argument challenging, among other things, the characterization of the Requests as "voluminous" and arguing that the County's evidence is further evidence of obstruction and noncompliance with the RTKL. On July 1, 2026, the OOR sought from the Requester an extension of time to issue the Final Determination in this appeal, which the Requester denied.²

LEGAL ANALYSIS

The County is a local agency subject to the RTKL. 65 P.S. § 67.302. Records in the possession of a local agency are presumed to be public, unless exempt under the RTKL or other

¹ The Requester's submissions cite various "Maxims of Law" which are Latin phrases which appear to have been drawn from English Chancery cases, maxims of law authored by Sir Francis Bacon circa. 1630, and other various English common law sources which predate any relevant legal authority within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

² The RTKL requires that the OOR issue a Final Determination within 30 days and states that the sole ability to grant an extension beyond that timeframe lies with the Requester. 65 P.S. § 67.1101(b)(1) ("Unless the requester agrees otherwise, the appeals officer shall make a final determination which shall be mailed to the requester and the agency within 30 days of receipt of the appeal filed under subsection (a).").

law or protected by a privilege, judicial order or decree. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.305. As an agency subject to the RTKL, the County is required to demonstrate, “by a preponderance of the evidence,” that records are exempt from public access. 65 P.S. § 67.708(a)(1). Preponderance of the evidence has been defined as “such proof as leads the fact-finder ... to find that the existence of a contested fact is more probable than its nonexistence.” *Pa. State Troopers Ass’n v. Scolforo*, 18 A.3d 435, 439 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011) (quoting *Pa. Dep’t of Transp. v. Agric. Lands Condemnation Approval Bd.*, 5 A.3d 821, 827 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010)).

An agency is only required to provide access to the records of that agency under the RTKL and is not required to conduct a search for or produce the records of other agencies in response to a RTKL request. *See generally, Mutchler v. Pa. Off. of Admin.*, 334 A.3d 57, 2025 Pa. Commw. LEXIS 50 (Pa. Commw. Ct., Mar. 18, 2025) (in the context of the applicability of 65 P.S. § 67.506(d)(1), the Commonwealth Court explained that the RTKL does not “require one agency to obtain from another agency information that the requester could get from that other agency directly”), *petition for allowance of appeal granted in limited part*, No. 196 MAL 2025, 2025 Pa. LEXIS 1472 (Sept. 23, 2025).

1. The OOR does not have jurisdiction over judicial records

The majority of both Requests seeks records of the County DRS or records relating to Title IV-D³ budgeting, revenue, reimbursements, incentive payments, or fund distribution which by necessity of law would be records of the County DRS.⁴ The OOR only has jurisdiction over appeals

³ The Request seeks records related to Title IV-D, which is a section within the federal Social Security Act that mandates that states establish uniform procedures and rules for providing child support enforcement services. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 651, *et seq.* In Pennsylvania, child support collection and enforcement are effectuated by the domestic relations sections of each county. *See* 23 Pa.C.S. § 4371 *et seq.* Thus, in the context of this Request, any portion of the Request seeking information related to Title IV-D finances and functions within the County is seeking records relating to the Franklin County Domestic Relations Section.

⁴ These portions of Request 1 are Parts 1 through 16, 29 through 52, 55 through 57, 59 through 69, and 71 through 77. These portions of Request 2 are Parts 1 through 5, 20 through 23, 25, 28 through 29, and 31 through 34.

of records of Commonwealth and local agencies and records of judicial agencies are outside the jurisdiction of the OOR. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.503(a); see also 65 P.S. § 67.102 (defining a “judicial agency” as “[a] court of the Commonwealth or any other entity or office of the unified judicial system.”).

In *Court of Common Pleas of Lackawanna Cnty. v. Office of Open Records*, the Commonwealth Court found that emails of a judicial employee, even though they were in the possession of the county, were records of a judicial agency. 2 A.3d 810, 813 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010). The Court noted:

The fact that [the Director of Domestic Relations] was paid by the [c]ounty does not affect his status as a judicial employee.... Likewise, the fact that the [c]ounty had access to [the] e-mails because it provided the [c]ounty’s court computer system is irrelevant. Counties in Pennsylvania were created to provide for courts, attendant jails and filing offices.... Just because the [c]ounty provides logistic support to the courts does not mean that every record stored on what the [c]ounty provides as part of its function to support the court makes it a [c]ounty record--those records always remain the records of the Court. Otherwise, every record ever generated by a [c]ounty court...would be accessible through the RTKL simply by submitting the request to the [c]ounty instead, an absurd result that would make Section 304 of the RTKL meaningless....

Id. As a result, the Court found that the OOR was prohibited from ordering the release of the records of the Director of the Domestic Relations Section, because to do so would violate the constitutional separation of powers. *Id.* at 813-14.

In *Grine v. County of Centre*, the Commonwealth Court addressed whether phone records were records of a judicial or local agency, where the local agency made payments for the judiciary’s cellular services. 138 A.3d 88 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2016). The Court stated that when discerning whether a record qualifies as a record “of” a particular agency, an agency must look to the subject matter of the records. *Id.* at 95. The Court found that “the judiciary retains control over records showing the activities of uniform judicial system personnel,” and held that because the

phone records documents activities of judicial personnel, the request is required to be directed to the appropriate judicial agency. *Id.* at 100; *see also* 65 P.S. § 67.102 (defining a “record” as “[i]nformation ... that documents a transaction or activity of an agency and that is created, received or retained pursuant to law or in connection with a transaction, business or activity of the agency”); 65 P.S. § 67.503(b).

Judicial records are not limited to records of case files, but also include administrative and personnel records of judicial agencies. *See, e.g., Hutchman v. Allegheny Cnty.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2025-3731, 2026 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 284 (determining that the county reasonably interpreted a request, which sought in part, all records, documents or communications possessed by any county office that “coordinates with the Fifth Judicial District or Family Division for administrative or personnel purposes” that contained or referenced the requester’s name, “to potentially include judicial records”); *Whaley v. Lycoming Cnty.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2025-0701, 2025 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 1129 (where a requester seeks oaths, bonds and policies related thereto, maintained by the prothonotary’s office or the recorder of deeds’ office, the request seeks judicial records over which the OOR lacks jurisdiction); *Lisi v. Lancaster Cnty.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2022-2416, 2022 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 2632 (finding that video footage from the entrance/exit to the county courthouse parking garage reserved for use primarily by elected officials and judges was a judicial record)

The Brackbill Attestation states that the County does not oversee the Domestic Relations Section and does not administer the Title IV-D program and that the records sought relating to DRS or the administration of the Title IV-D program are records of the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas. *See* Brackbill Attestation ¶¶ 8-10. Pennsylvania RTKL precedent is clear that certain public agencies, despite working with and within the framework of county governance, are judicial agencies and not local agencies under the RTKL. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.503(a); *see also Faulk*

v. Phila. Clerk of Courts, 116 A.3d 1183, 1186 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2015) (holding that records of the county Clerk of Courts are judicial records); *Frazier v. Phila. Cty. Office of the Prothonotary*, 58 A.3d 858, 859-60 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2012) (holding that records of the county Prothonotary are judicial records); *Wills & Clerk of the Orphans Court of Phila. License Marriage Bur. v. Office of Open Records*, No. 1671 C.D. 2009, 2010 Pa. Commw. Unpub. LEXIS 922 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010) (holding that the county Register of Wills is a judicial agency). As previously noted, the Commonwealth Court specifically held that the records of the County Domestic Relations Section are judicial records under the RTKL and the OOR does not have jurisdiction over such records. *See Court of Common Pleas of Lackawanna Cnty.*, 2 A.3d at 814.

Accordingly, the portions of the Request seeking records of Franklin County DRS and the administration of the Title IV-D program, the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas and the judges presiding therein, the Franklin County Prothonotary, the Franklin County Register of Wills, and the Franklin County Clerk of Courts are judicial records and the appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction as to these portions of the Request. The Requester is not prohibited from submitting a request for financial records to the appropriate judicial agency for any judicial financial records sought. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.304.

2. The remainder of the Requests are insufficiently specific in part

a. Parts of the Request seek answers to questions or for the County to conduct research to respond to the Request

Part 53 of Request 1 seeks “Franklin County Home Rule Charter, if one exists. If no charter exists, provide written confirmation identifying the specific form of government under which Franklin County operates and the statutory authority.”⁵ Part 54 of Request 1 seeks “All county

⁵ Franklin County is a Fourth Class County and is governed by the laws of Pennsylvania relating to counties of that class. *See* <https://www.franklincountypa.gov/faqs/what-class-county-is-franklin-county/> (last visited July 2, 2026); *see also* <https://www.pacounties.org/about/pennsylvania-county-by-class> (last visited July 2, 2026).

ordinances or written policies governing competitive bidding thresholds, contract approval requirements, and conflict of interest requirements for county commissioners, judges, and DRS employees.” The County is not required to answer questions or perform legal research for the Requester to help him identify specific statutes or ordinances which specifically relate to the County, the judicial system, or their operations. A request that explicitly or implicitly obliges legal research is not a request for a specific document; rather it is a request for someone to conduct legal research with the hope that the legal research will unearth a specific document that fits the description of the request. *Askew v. Pa. Off. of the Governor*, 65 A.3d 989, 993 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013); *Gingrich v. Pa. Game Comm’n*, No. 1254 C.D. 2011, 2012 Pa. Commw. Unpub. LEXIS 38 at *14 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012) (holding that a request to verify certain information may involve research and was therefore inappropriate); *Reasbeck v. Pa. Dep’t of Community and Econ. Dev.*, OOR Dkt. AP 2026-0483, 2026 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 948 (denying a request seeking records reflecting internal policy, instruction, guidance, directive or law relied upon to authorize or justify certain actions). Accordingly, the appeal is denied as to Part 53 and 54 of Request 1.

b. Parts of the Request are insufficiently specific for the County to conduct a good faith search

Section 703 of the RTKL, provides that “[a] written request should identify or describe the records sought with sufficient specificity to enable the agency to ascertain which records are being requested” 65 P.S. § 67.703. When determining whether a particular request is sufficiently specific, the OOR uses the nonexclusive, multifactor test employed by the Commonwealth Court in *Pa. Dep’t of Educ. v. Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 119 A.3d 1121 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2015). *See Pa. Off. of the Governor v. Brelje*, 312 A.3d 928 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2024).

First, “[t]he subject matter of the request must identify the ‘transaction or activity’ of the agency for which the record is sought[,]” and “should provide a context to narrow the search.”

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 119 A.3d at 1125 (quoting 65 P.S. § 67.102; *Montgomery Cnty. v. Iverson*, 50 A.3d 281, 284 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012)). Second, “[t]he scope of the request must identify ‘a discrete group of documents, either by type ... or by recipient.’” *Id.* (quoting *Carey v. Pa. Dep’t of Corr.*, 61 A.3d 367, 372 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013)). Finally, “[t]he timeframe of the request should identify a finite period of time for which records are sought.” *Id.* at 1126 (citing *Carey*, 61 A.3d at 372). “The timeframe prong is, however, the most fluid of the three prongs, and whether or not the request’s timeframe is narrow enough is generally dependent upon the specificity of the request’s subject matter and scope.” *Id.*

The above factors are intended “to facilitate an analysis in order to determine whether an agency can ascertain which records are being requested The subject matter, scope, and timeframe of a request are flexible, analytical elements, not evidentiary requirements.” *Pa. Dep’t of Health v. Shepherd*, No. 377 C.D. 2021, 2022 Pa. Commw. Unpub. LEXIS 207, *6-7 (Pa. Commw. Ct. May 13, 2022), *appeal denied*, No. 334 MAL 2022, 2022 Pa. LEXIS 1862 (Pa. 2022) (citations omitted). Furthermore, we must analyze the entirety of a request, as it is possible that portions of a request are insufficiently specific, while other portions provide sufficient guidance. *See Pa. State Police v. Off. of Open Records*, 995 A.2d 515, 517 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2010) (noting “the valid part of the request was included in a laundry list of requested materials ...”).

Of note, a request for records under the RTKL may not amount to a “fishing expedition” by the Requester. *See, e.g., Pa. Dep’t of Educ.*, 119 A.3d at 1126; *Commonwealth v. Engelkemier*, 148 A.3d 522 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2016). Pennsylvania courts have also compared broad, sweeping requests to discovery-type requests, while potentially proper in the context of civil litigation, are improper under the RTKL. *Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. v. Pa. Dep’t of Gen Servs.*, 747 A.2d 962, 965-66 (Pa. Commw. 2000) (holding that requests “akin to document requests under

the civil discovery rules, i.e., ‘any and all documents relating to [subject matter]’” lack sufficient specificity); *see also*, *Moscatiello v. Crafton Borough*, OOR Dkt. AP 2024-1811, 2024 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 2330.

i. Parts 17 through 19, 21 and 22

Parts 17 and 22 of Request 1 seek, for an approximate sixteen year timeframe, lease agreements between and “total dollar amount paid annually” by the County to B Developed, LLC, B Developed, Inc, and “any entity owned or controlled by any member of the Finucane or Stouffer families[.]” The portions of Parts 17 and 22 seeking records relating to B Developed, LLC or B Developed, Inc. are sufficiently specific as the County is able to discern what records are being sought. The County is directed to conduct a good faith search for records responsive to Parts 17 and 22 of Request 1 seeking records of lease agreements between and reflecting total dollar amount paid annually by the County to B Developed, LLC or B Developed, Inc.⁶

Notwithstanding, the subject-matter of any entity which is owned or controlled by two specified family surnames is not a specific enough subject-matter for the County to reasonably conduct a good faith search. Accordingly, the portions of Parts 17 and 22 of Request 1 seeking records between the County and “any entity owned or controlled by any member of the Finucane or Stouffer families” is insufficiently specific.

Parts 18, 19, and 21 of Request 1 seek in relation to any lease agreements identified as responsive to Part 17 of Request 1, additional records which reflect certain information relating to the terms of the lease, the parties to the lease agreements, and the County’s procurement process as to the lease agreement(s) responsive to Part 17. To the extent such records exist, the County is

⁶ The OOR notes that the Request can only seek records of the County and not the Court of Common Pleas, the County DRS, Court Administration, or other judicial agencies. Thus, the County is directed to conduct a search for any lease agreements or records reflecting annual dollar amounts paid to B Developed, LLC or B Developed, Inc. that relate to the transactions or activity of the County itself.

directed to provide them to the Requester.

ii. Parts 23 and 24

Part 23 of Request 1 seeks for a timeframe of sixteen years, records reflecting “the total dollar amount paid annually by Franklin County to Salzmann Hughes, P.C. (or any predecessor or successor entity), from any county fund or account.” Part 24 of Request 1 seeks for a timeframe of sixteen years, records reflecting:

[T]he total dollar amount paid annually by Franklin County to each of the following, from any county fund or account: (a) The Pineapple Group or Laura Sponseller; (b) Nicklas Settlement Company or Kristin M. Nicklas in any non-salary capacity; (c) GMS Funding Solutions; (d) Women in Need, Inc.; (e) Mid-Penn Legal Services; (f) United Way of Franklin County.

To the extent that the County possesses records reflecting the total dollar amount paid annually to the persons or entities identified in Parts 23 and 24 of the Request *that relate to a transaction or activity of the County and not a judicial agency*, the County is directed to provide such records to the Requester.

iii. Parts 25 through 28 of Request 1

Parts 25 through 28 of Request 1 seek emails of the entire County email system for a timeframe of over sixteen years relating to various subject-matters or containing certain keywords. The scope is broad seeking all emails within the County email system, the timeframe is very long, and the subject-matters are not so narrow as to render these parts of the Request to be sufficiently specific. *See Ertle v Pocono Mountain Police Department*, OOR Dkt. AP 2026-1169, 2026 PA O.O.R.D. LEXIS 1436 (holding that a request for all emails of “administrative communications” of a police department for a timeframe of more than six years is insufficiently specific where the agency would be required to review a large volume of records and make judgment calls). Accordingly, the OOR finds that Parts 25 through 28 of Request 1 are overbroad and insufficiently

specific for the County to conduct a search for responsive records.

iv. Parts 20, 55 and 58 of Request 1

Part 58 of Request 1 seeks records which are facially public records, such as the meeting minutes,⁷ records reflecting votes, and resolutions of County Commissioners for a timeframe of over sixteen years. Notwithstanding, Part 58 specifically demands that the meeting minutes, vote records, and resolutions sought must relate to specified subject matters, such as certain lease agreements, any legal services contracts for DRS, the Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement, and disbursement of funds from the Title IV-D restricted account. Similarly, Part 20 of Request 1 also seeks meeting minutes, resolutions, and vote records related to a very specific subject-matter. In order for the County to produce records specifically responsive to Parts 20 and 58, it would be required to review all responsive records for the over sixteen-year timeframe and make judgment calls as to whether the records relate to the specified subject-matter. Because of this, Parts 20 and 58 of Request 1 are insufficiently specific. *See Pa. Dep't of Env't Prot. v. Legere*, 50 A.3d 260, 264-265 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012) (finding that a request that would require an agency to review all potentially responsive files and “make judgments as to the relation of the documents to the specific request” would be insufficiently specific).

Similarly, the first portion of Part 55 of Request 1 seeks conflict of interest disclosures, financial interest statements, and ethics filings submitted by the County Commissioners for a timeframe of over sixteen years which reference “any financial interest in B Developed, Salzmann Hughes, The Pineapple Group, Nicklas Settlement Company, GMS Funding Solutions, or any entity owned by any member of the Meyers, Finucane, Stouffer, Sponseller, Nicklas, or Anthony families.” To respond to this portion of Part 55 of Request 1, the County would be required to

⁷ The meeting minutes and agendas of the Franklin County Commissioners are available on the County’s website. *See* <https://www.franklincountypa.gov/departments/commissioners-office/> (last visited July 2, 2026).

review all potentially responsive records for a lengthy timeframe and make judgment calls. As such, Part 55 of Request 1 is insufficiently specific.

v. Parts 70 and 71 of Request 1

Part 70 of Request 1 seeks in part, “[f]or fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of the Franklin County Sheriff’s Department annual operating budget[.]” Part 71 of Request 1 seeks in part, “All Statements of Financial Interests (SEC-1 forms) filed by Dane M. Anthony with the PA State Ethics Commission from 2007 to present[.]” The records responsive to the quoted portions of Parts 70 and 71, to the extent they exist, are public records and should be provided to the Requester. Notwithstanding, the remaining portion of Part 70 of the Request asks the County to produce “the total dollar amount and percentage of that budget derived from Title IV-D reimbursement revenue” and for the County to detail which portions of the Sheriff’s Office budget flow to or from certain sources. For the reasons set forth in Part 2.a. of this Final Determination, the County Sheriff’s budget speaks for itself and the County is not required to further specify which portions in the County Sheriff’s budget records relate to Title IV-D reimbursements, sheriff’s sales, warrant service, or other revenue streams. Additionally, and for the reasons stated in Part 1 of the Final Determination, the remaining portion of Part 71 of Request 1 seeks records related to the director of the County DRS and is thus a record of a judicial agency and outside of the jurisdiction of the OOR.

vi. Part 9 of Request 2

Part 9 of Request 2 seeks all records identifying the source of funds used to pay the County’s PCoRP insurance premiums, and specifically whether any portion of the premium is paid from Title IV-D reimbursement revenue, Title IV-D incentive payment revenue, or the Title IV-D restricted account. There is no timeframe for Part 9 of Request 2, the scope of the Request is broad

seeking all records, and the subject-matter is vague relating to all source of funding for the County's insurance premiums. Accordingly, the OOR finds that Part 9 of Request 2 is insufficiently specific for the County to conduct a good faith search for all responsive records.

Part 9 of Request 2 further seeks that the County provide records which answers whether the County's insurance premiums are paid for through Title IV-D funding. The County has explicitly stated that implementation of the Title IV-D programs is a function of the judicial system and not the County. Records reflecting the expenditures of funds of a judicial agency are not records of the County, and thus the second portion of Part 9 of Request 2 seeks records that do not document a transaction or activity of the County.

vii. Parts 18 and 19 of Request 2

Part 18 of Request 2 seeks "All official surety bonds, fidelity bonds, and faithful performance bonds held by or on behalf of any Franklin County official, employee, or contractor required to be bonded under Act 106 of 2011 or any other statute, from 2015 to present . . ." Part 19 of the Request seeks additional information related all bond records of the County for the eleven year time frame. The scope and subject-matter of Parts 18 and 19 of Request 2 is very broad, seeking all bonds held by any official, employee, or contractor of the County. The timeframe is also lengthy, being approximately eleven years. As such, the OOR finds that Parts 18 and 19 of Request 2 is insufficiently specific for the County to conduct a good faith search for all potentially responsive bond records.

3. The Request seeks certain records that are facially exempt from public disclosure

a. Certain records are exempt from public disclosure under the Internal Revenue Code

Part 31 of Request 2 seeks "[a]ll IRS Forms W-2 or 1099s issued by Franklin County to each DRS employee, hearing officer, support master, and contracted legal services provider from

2015 to present” Under the RTKL, records exempt from public access under federal law do not constitute public records. *See* 65 P.S. § 67.305(a)(3). Section 6103(a) of the Internal Revenue Code (“Code”) prohibits disclosure of “return information,” 26 U.S.C. § 6103(a). The Code defines return information as follows:

(2) Return information. The term “return information” means—

a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments, whether the taxpayer’s return was, is being, or will be examined or subject to other investigation or processing, or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability (or the amount thereof) of any person under this title for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]

26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2). The W-2 forms of County employees or 1099 forms issued by the County are exempt from public access under the RTKL as they would reveal confidential tax information under federal law. Accordingly, the appeal as to Part 31 of Request 2 is denied.

b. Certain records sought are exempt as communications between an agency and its insurance carrier

Parts 11 through 17 and 24 of Request 2 seeks records that on their face are records of communications between an agency and their insurance carrier. Section 708(b)(27) of the RTKL exempts “[a] record or information relating to a communication between an agency and its insurance carrier, administrative service organization or risk management office.” 65 P.S. § 67.708(b)(27). Further, Section 708(b)(27) additionally states that this section “shall not apply to a contract with an insurance carrier, administrative service organization or risk management office or to financial records relating to the provision of insurance.” *Id.* Because Parts 11 through 17 and 24 of Request 2 seek claims records, records of insurance defense costs, coverage denials, reservation of rights letters, and other records that would reflect communications between the

County and its insurance carrier, the appeal is denied as to these portions of Request 2.

c. The County proved that no records responsive to Part 30 of Request 2 exist

Part 30 of Request 2 of the Request seeks a written statement from the County Solicitor identifying whether the Franklin County DRS, its hearing officers, support masters, and contracted legal services providers are classified as County employees or independent contractors. The Brackbill Attestation states that she conducted a search and that no such record exists in the County's possession, custody, or control. *See* Brackbill Attestation ¶ 12. Based on the evidence submitted in this appeal, the OOR finds no basis to determine that a written statement drafted by the County's solicitor relating to the specified subject-matter exists in the County's possession, custody, or control. *See Pa. Dep't of Health v. Mahon*, 283 A.3d 929, 936 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2022) (holding that in the absence of countervailing evidence or questionable credibility, the open records officer's attestation that a search was conducted and no responsive records exist is sufficient to sustain the agency's burden of proof).

4. The County failed to prove that certain records are exempt from disclosure

As noted in Part 3.b. of this Final Determination, while communications between an agency and its insurance carrier are exempt, the County's actual insurance contracts are not exempt from disclosure under Section 708(b)(27) the RTKL. Part 6 of Request 2 seeks "[a]ll PCoRP Coverage Documents, certificates of insurance, policy declarations, and coverage schedules for Franklin County from June 1, 2013 to the present, including all endorsements, amendments, riders, and supplemental coverage forms." Parts 7, 8, and 10 of Request 2 seek more specific information related to the County's insurance contract with PcoRP, insurance premiums paid, and the "PCoRP Crime coverage declarations page" for a timeframe of approximately thirteen years.

Similarly, Part 26 of Request 2 seeks "[f]or fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar

amount of PCoRP insurance premiums paid by Franklin County. . . .” and Part 27 of Request 2 seeks “[f]or fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of surety bond premiums paid by Franklin County. . . .”⁸ Based on the evidence submitted in this appeal, the OOR is unable to discern why records of the County’s insurance contracts, insurance premiums and bond premiums paid would not reflect a transaction or activity of the County itself or would otherwise be exempt from public disclosure as they are records of the County which detail the expenditure of County funds. As such, the OOR finds that the County is required to conduct a good faith search for records responsive to Parts 6, 7, 8, 10, 26, and 27 of Part 2 of the Request reflecting the County’s insurance contract and premiums paid for the County’s insurance through PCoRP.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is **granted in part, denied in part and dismissed for lack of jurisdiction in part**, and the County is required to conduct a good faith search for records responsive to: (a) Parts 18, 19, 21, 23 and 24 of Request 1; (b) the relevant portions of Parts 17, 22, 70, and 71 of Request 1; (c) Parts 6, 7, 8 and 10 of Request 2; and (d) the specified portions of Parts 26 and 27 of Request 2 and provide all responsive records that exist within the County’s possession, custody, or control within thirty (30) days. This Final Determination is binding on all parties. Within thirty days of the mailing date of this Final Determination, any party may appeal to the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas. 65 P.S. § 67.1302(a). All parties must be served with notice of the appeal. The OOR also shall be served notice and have an opportunity to respond according to court rules as per 65 P.S. § 67.1303, but as the quasi-judicial tribunal adjudicating this matter, the OOR is not a proper party to any appeal and should not be

⁸ The remaining portions of Parts 26 and 27 of Request 2 seek the percentage or dollar amount claimed on the Title IV-D Monthly Statement of Expenditures (“MSE”). The County makes clear that it does not oversee the Title IV-D program, but that is instead overseen by the courts and the DRS. *See* Brackbill Attestation ¶¶ 7-11. Accordingly, the appeal is denied for lack of jurisdiction as to the second portions of Parts 26 and 27 of the Request.

named as a party.⁹ All documents or communications following the issuance of this Final Determination shall be sent to oor-postfd@pa.gov. This Final Determination shall be placed on the OOR website at: <http://openrecords.pa.gov>.

FINAL DETERMINATION ISSUED AND MAILED: July 9, 2026

/s/ Catherine R. Hecker

CATHERINE R. HECKER
APPEALS OFFICER

Sent via portal to: Allen Shultz
Becky Brackbill
Elliott Sulcove, Esq.

⁹ *Padgett v. Pa. State Police*, 73 A.3d 644, 648 n.5 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2013).

ATTACHMENT A

REQUEST 1

... IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS TO RECORDS OFFICER:

All items below are sequentially numbered 01 through the final item. Responses **MUST** be aligned with the corresponding item number. If a response requires multiple documents or data sets, label each as “Response to Item [number].” If any requested data is publicly available online, the county must still provide the data in its response **AND** provide the exact URL where the data is publicly posted as officially acknowledged by Franklin County. A denial based solely on public availability is not a valid basis for denial under the Right-to-Know Law. If any item is denied, cite the specific statutory exemption under 65 P.S. § 67.708 for each denied item individually. Fee waiver is requested under 65 P.S. § 67.1307(f). This request is in the public interest. Requester is a 100% federally adjudicated disabled person receiving SSDI and is financially unable to pay fees.

SECTION A: TITLE IV-D REIMBURSEMENT REVENUE

The following items request records relating to the 66% federal reimbursement of expenditures submitted by the Franklin County Domestic Relations Section (DRS) to the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services (DHS) under the Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement. “Reimbursement” means the federal share of DRS operational costs claimed on the Monthly Statement of Expenditures (MSE).

01. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the complete Title IV-D Annual Budget Plan (Cooperative Agreement Attachment B) for the Franklin County DRS, including all sections (A, B, and C) and all budget line items (Lines 101 through 140).
02. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, all Monthly Statements of Expenditure (MSEs) submitted by the Franklin County DRS to PA DHS, including all supplemental MSEs.
03. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of Title IV-D reimbursement revenue received by Franklin County from DHS, broken down by fiscal year.
04. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount claimed by the Franklin County DRS on Budget Line 113 (Legal & Hearing Officer Costs), broken down by fiscal year, and the identity of each legal services provider paid under this line item.
05. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount claimed by the Franklin County DRS on Budget Line 114 (Other Contracted Costs), broken down by fiscal year, and the identity of each contracted entity paid under this line item.
06. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount claimed by the Franklin County DRS on Budget Line 115 (Building Rental/Leases), broken down by fiscal year, and the identity of each landlord or property owner paid under this line item.

07. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount claimed by the Franklin County DRS on Budget Lines 116 through 119 (Building Depreciation, Repairs & Maintenance, Utilities, and Telephone), broken down by fiscal year and by line item.
08. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount claimed by the Franklin County DRS on Budget Line 140 (Indirect Costs via Central Services Cost Allocation Plan), broken down by fiscal year.
09. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, all Retirement Reconciliation Worksheets (RRWs) submitted by the Franklin County DRS to DHS.

SECTION B: TITLE IV-D INCENTIVE PAYMENT REVENUE

The following items request records relating to the federal incentive payments received by Franklin County under 42 U.S.C. § 658a, computed based on the five federal performance measures. “Incentive payments” are distinct from reimbursement and are performance-based bonus payments.

10. For federal fiscal years 2014 through 2025, the total dollar amount of Title IV-D incentive payments received by Franklin County, broken down by federal fiscal year.
11. For federal fiscal years 2014 through 2025, Franklin County’s performance scores on each of the five federal performance measures (paternity establishment, support order establishment, current collections, arrears collections, and cost-effectiveness), as reported to DHS.
12. For federal fiscal years 2014 through 2025, the computation worksheet or formula showing how Franklin County’s share of the statewide incentive pool was calculated, including the county’s proportionate share percentage.
13. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, all records showing how Title IV-D incentive payments received by Franklin County were spent, including all disbursements from the Title IV-D restricted account authorized by the President Judge and/or County Commissioners.
14. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the Title IV-D restricted account balance as of the end of each fiscal year, including total receipts (broken down by reimbursement revenue and incentive payment revenue) and total disbursements.

SECTION C: CONTRACTS, LEASES, AND CONNECTED-ENTITY PAYMENTS

15. All legal service agreements, contracts, or intergovernmental agreements between the Franklin County DRS and any law firm, attorney, sheriff, or legal services provider for Page 3 the provision of Title IV-D legal services from 2010 to present, including but not limited to any contract with Salzmans Hughes, P.C. or any entity in which Nancy H. Meyers or Eileen C. Finucane is a partner, member, officer, or employee.

16. All contracts, agreements, and records of payments between Franklin County and GMS Funding Solutions, or any entity handling Title IV-D federal fund distribution for Franklin County, from 2010 to present.
17. The original lease agreement including but not limited to any and all addenda, amendments, extensions, renewals, rate increases, and modifications between Franklin County (including any county agency, office, the Court of Common Pleas, or the DRS) and B Developed, LLC; B Developed, Inc.; or any entity owned or controlled by any member of the Finucane family or the Stouffer family, for any property including but not limited to 340 S. Second Street, Chambersburg, PA, from 2010 to present.
18. For the lease(s) identified in Item 17: the square footage leased, the rental rate per square foot, the total annual cost, the lease term, all escalation clauses, and which county offices or court divisions occupy the leased space.
19. For the lease(s) identified in Item 17: all records of any competitive bidding, RFP process, or sole-source justification.
20. For the lease(s) identified in Item 17: all county commissioner meeting minutes, resolutions, or votes authorizing the lease or any amendment, addendum, extension, modification, or rate increase.
21. For the lease(s) identified in Item 17: all records identifying the ownership, partners, members, officers, or principals of B Developed, including any disclosure of financial interests by any county official, judge, or their family members.
22. For fiscal years 2010 through 2025, the total dollar amount paid annually by Franklin County to B Developed, LLC or any entity owned or controlled by any member of the Finucane or Stouffer families, from any county fund or account.
23. For fiscal years 2010 through 2025, the total dollar amount paid annually by Franklin County to Salzmann Hughes, P.C. (or any predecessor or successor entity), from any county fund or account.
24. For fiscal years 2010 through 2025, the total dollar amount paid annually by Franklin County to each of the following, from any county fund or account: (a) The Pineapple Group or Laura Sponseller; (b) Nicklas Settlement Company or Kristin M. Nicklas in any non-salary capacity; (c) GMS Funding Solutions; (d) Women in Need, Inc.; (e) Mid-Penn Legal Services; (f) United Way of Franklin County.

SECTION D: COMMUNICATIONS — COUNTY EMAIL SYSTEM SEARCH

25. All emails in the Franklin County email system from 2010 to present containing or referencing any of the following terms: “340 S. Second Street” or “340 South Second” or “B Developed” or “Finucane” or “Stouffer.”

26. All emails between any Franklin County email address and any email address associated with any member of the Finucane or Stouffer families, or any officer, agent, or representative of B Developed, from 2010 to present.
27. All internal Franklin County emails from 2010 to present discussing, referencing, or relating to any lease, contract, payment, negotiation, or business transaction with B Developed or any Finucane or Stouffer family member or entity.
28. All emails from 2010 to present relating to the DRS office relocation to 157 Lincoln Way East (the refurbished old courthouse building), including any emails discussing the purpose, cost, or approval of the relocation.

SECTION E: CASELOAD, COLLECTIONS, AND ENFORCEMENT DATA

29. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of active Title IV-D cases in Franklin County at the end of each fiscal year.
30. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of child support collections in Franklin County, broken down by fiscal year.
31. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of new support orders entered in Franklin County, broken down by fiscal year.
32. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of contempt filings in Franklin County Title IV-D cases, broken down by fiscal year.
33. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of modification petitions filed by defendants (obligors) in Franklin County Title IV-D cases, and the total number granted versus denied, broken down by fiscal year.
34. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of case closures in Franklin County Title IV-D cases, broken down by fiscal year.
35. For fiscal years 2020 through 2025, the total number of Title IV-D cases in Franklin County that have been open for (a) more than 5 years; (b) more than 10 years; (c) more than 15 years.
36. As of the most recent reporting period, the total accumulated arrears balance in all Franklin County Title IV-D cases.

SECTION F: DISABILITY BENEFIT CONVERSION DATA

The following items request data necessary to determine whether Franklin County has engaged in systematic conversion of federally protected Social Security Disability Benefits (SSDI/SSI) into Title IV-D reimbursement revenue and incentive payment revenue in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 407(a).

37. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of Title IV-D cases in Franklin County in which the noncustodial parent (obligor) is a recipient of Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), or any other SSA disability benefit.
38. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of support obligations ordered against SSA-disabled obligors in Franklin County Title IV-D cases.
39. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount actually collected from SSA-disabled obligors in Franklin County Title IV-D cases.
40. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of cases in Franklin County in which the DRS, any hearing officer, support master, or judge imputed earning capacity to an obligor who had been adjudicated disabled by the Social Security Administration, and the total dollar amount of imputed income ordered in such cases.
41. For each case identified in Item 40: the case number, the SSA disability award date, the monthly SSDI/SSI benefit amount, the imputed income amount ordered, and the name of the hearing officer, support master, or judge who ordered the imputation.
42. For each case identified in Item 40: whether *Ewing v. Ewing*, 843 A.2d 1282 (Pa. Super. 2004) or Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-2(d)(4) was cited as the legal authority for the imputation.
43. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of Title IV-D reimbursement revenue and incentive payment revenue generated from collections against SSA-disabled obligors in Franklin County.
44. All written policies, procedures, guidelines, training materials, bench books, hearing officer instructions, or DRS memoranda used by the Franklin County DRS regarding: the treatment of SSA disability benefits in support calculations; the imputation of earning capacity to SSA-disabled obligors; the application of *Ewing v. Ewing* to SSA-disabled obligors; the applicability of 42 U.S.C. § 407(a); and any distinction between voluntary underemployment and involuntary permanent disability.
45. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of cases in which an obligor raised 42 U.S.C. § 407 as a defense to garnishment of SSDI benefits, and the court's or hearing officer's ruling on that defense in each case.
46. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of wage attachment, income withholding, or garnishment orders issued by the Franklin County DRS or Court of Common Pleas against any SSDI, SSI, or Social Security benefit payment, and the total dollar amount garnished from such benefit payments.
47. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of contempt proceedings initiated against SSA-disabled obligors in Franklin County, and the number resulting in

incarceration or threat of incarceration.

SECTION G: PROPERTY SEIZURE AND ACQUISITION DATA

48. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, all records of real property seized, sold, or transferred through Franklin County Domestic Relations proceedings, sheriff sales, or court orders, including the case number, property address, sale price, and buyer identity for each transaction.
49. For the transactions identified in Item 48, identify any transaction in which The Pineapple Group, any Stouffer LLC, B Developed, any Sponseller-family member, any Finucane-family member, or any entity connected to Salzman Hughes P.C. was the buyer or was involved in the transaction.
50. For the transactions identified in Item 48, identify any transaction in which Kristin M. Nicklas was the DRS attorney of record AND The Pineapple Group, any Sponseller-family entity, or any Stouffer-family entity was the buyer.

SECTION H: GOVERNANCE, PERSONNEL, AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

51. The executed signature pages of all Title IV-D Cooperative Agreements signed by any President Judge or County Commissioner of the 39th Judicial District from 2010 to present.
52. All Disclosure of Lobbying Activities forms (SF-LLL) filed under 31 U.S.C. § 1352 in connection with the Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement from 2010 to present.
53. The Franklin County Home Rule Charter, if one exists. If no charter exists, provide written confirmation identifying the specific form of government under which Franklin County operates and the statutory authority.
54. All county ordinances or written policies governing competitive bidding thresholds, contract approval requirements, and conflict of interest requirements for county commissioners, judges, and DRS employees.
55. All conflict of interest disclosures, financial interest statements, and ethics filings submitted by any Franklin County Commissioner, any judge of the 39th Judicial District, any DRS employee, and any Sheriff's office employee from 2010 to present referencing any financial interest in B Developed, Salzman Hughes, The Pineapple Group, Nicklas Settlement Company, GMS Funding Solutions, or any entity owned by any member of the Meyers, Finucane, Stouffer, Sponseller, Nicklas, or Anthony families.
56. The personnel file and employment records of Martha Walker, including dates of employment, position(s) held, and all policies or training materials authored by Walker relating to the DRS or Title IV-D program.
57. The personnel file and employment records of Teresa Anthony, including any disclosure of

her marital relationship to Sheriff Dane Anthony.

58. All county commissioner meeting minutes, resolutions, and votes from 2010 to present relating to: execution or renewal of the Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement; approval of any lease with B Developed; approval of any legal services contract for the DRS; authorization of disbursements from the Title IV-D restricted account; and DRS office relocation.

SECTION I: DRS POLICIES — MONELL LIABILITY EVIDENCE

Requested as evidence of official county policy under *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978).

59. All written policies, procedures, manuals, and training materials used by the Franklin County DRS regarding case modification procedures and criteria for granting or denying modification petitions.
60. All written policies, procedures, manuals, and training materials used by the Franklin County DRS regarding case closure criteria and when cases should or should not be closed.
61. All written policies, procedures, manuals, and training materials used by the Franklin County DRS regarding support order establishment guidelines and how obligation amounts are calculated.
62. All written policies, procedures, manuals, and training materials used by the Franklin County DRS regarding management of federal performance measures, including strategies to improve or maintain performance scores.
63. All written policies, procedures, manuals, and training materials used by the Franklin County DRS regarding ADA accommodation procedures for disabled litigants.
64. All written policies, procedures, manuals, and training materials used by the Franklin County DRS regarding hold report management and the timing of distribution of collected funds.
65. All records of building inspections, certificates of occupancy, and zoning approvals for any property leased to Franklin County from B Developed or any Stouffer/Finucane entity from 2010 to present.

SECTION J: COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT SECTION 2.2(g) COMPLIANCE — MANDATORY MODIFICATION DATA

Cooperative Agreement Section 2.2(g) requires the DRS to “initiate proceedings to review and modify support orders in accordance with federal and state law and Pa.R.Civ.P. whenever a verifiable material and substantial change in circumstances becomes known to the DRS.” The following items request data necessary to determine compliance with this mandatory duty.

66. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, of the total defendant modification petitions filed in

Franklin County Title IV-D cases each year: (a) the total number that resulted in a REDUCTION of the monthly support obligation, and the average dollar amount of the reduction; (b) the total number that resulted in NO CHANGE to the obligation; (c) the total number that resulted in an INCREASE to the obligation; (d) the total number that resulted in modification to a Non-Financial Obligation (NFOB); and (e) of those granted, how many involved SSA-disabled obligors.

67. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total number of cases in which the DRS initiated modification proceedings on its own motion (not in response to a party's petition) pursuant to Cooperative Agreement Section 2.2(g), upon learning of a verifiable material and substantial change in circumstances, and the total number of those DRS-initiated modifications that involved SSA-disabled obligors.
68. All records of any internal DRS policy, memorandum, directive, or instruction regarding when the DRS should or should not initiate modification proceedings under Cooperative Agreement Section 2.2(g), including any policy that prioritizes federal performance measure protection over the mandatory modification duty, and any policy regarding the treatment of SSA disability determinations as a "verifiable material and substantial change in circumstances."
69. The complete transcript, audio recording, or other record of any proceeding in which DRS Director Teresa Anthony testified regarding Franklin County's Title IV-D federal performance measure efficiency rate, including but not limited to any testimony in which Anthony stated or confirmed that the county exceeds 95% efficiency or otherwise meets or exceeds the thresholds for maximum federal incentive payments under 42 U.S.C. § 658a. If the county maintains that this testimony occurred in a judicial proceeding and claims a judicial exemption, the county must identify the specific proceeding by date, case number, and presiding officer, so that Plaintiff may obtain the transcript through alternative means.

SECTION K: SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT TITLE IV-D FUNDING AND ETHICS FILINGS

70. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of the Franklin County Sheriff's Department annual operating budget, and the total dollar amount and percentage of that budget derived from Title IV-D reimbursement revenue, including all costs claimed on the Title IV-D MSE for warrant service, contempt enforcement, sheriff sales, property seizures, courthouse security related to DRS proceedings, and any other Sheriff's Department activity reimbursed under the Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement.
71. All Statements of Financial Interests (SEC-1 forms) filed by Dane M. Anthony with the PA State Ethics Commission from 2007 to present, and all Statements of Financial Interests filed by Teresa Anthony from 2007 to present, and any amendments thereto. Cross-reference these filings against the Title IV-D reimbursement data produced in response to

Item 70 to determine whether either Anthony disclosed the Title IV-D funding pipeline between their respective offices.

72. All Statements of Financial Interests filed by Teresa Anthony from 2015 to present showing her business address, specifically to document the date on which her listed address changed from 218 N. Second Street (the pre-relocation DRS address) to 157 Lincoln Way East or any other address, to document the date of the DRS office relocation.
73. All courthouse security camera footage, recordings, and incident reports from July 15, 2022, documenting the physical removal of Allen L. Shultz III from the Franklin County Courthouse by Sheriff's deputies while Plaintiff was attempting to file legal documents at the Prothonotary's office. This incident was documented in a Notice to Clerk filed August 26, 2022 (Docket 2017-1766). All use-of-force reports, incident logs, and internal communications relating to this incident are also requested.

SECTION L: INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S CASES

The following items request all internal communications between county officials, judges, DRS employees, Salzmans Hughes attorneys, and any other party regarding any case captioned under the names Allen L. Shultz III, Faith Shultz, or any derivative thereof. These records are sought to identify ex parte communications in violation of Pa.R.J.A. 1701(a), Cooperative Agreement Section 3.13 (independence requirement), and Canon 3(A)(4) of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

74. All emails, memoranda, letters, notes, text messages, instant messages, and any other written or electronic communications in the Franklin County email system, the DRS internal systems, or any county-maintained communication platform from 2015 to present that reference, discuss, or relate to any case captioned under ALLEN L. SHULTZ III, FAITH SHULTZ, SHULTZ v. SHULTZ, or any derivative spelling thereof, including but not limited to Case No. 2024-3359, Case No. 2017-1766, and any other domestic relations, civil, or criminal case number in which Allen L. Shultz III appears as a party, and including all communications between any of the following: President Judge Shawn D. Meyers, Judge Todd J. Sponseller, Judge Angela R. Krom, Judge Jeremiah Zook, any hearing officer or support master, Teresa Anthony, Kristin M. Nicklas, Troy Young, any DRS employee, Tim Sponseller, Dane Anthony, any Sheriff's deputy, any Salzmans Hughes attorney, Douglas Herman, James Stein, judge Van Eck, Imblum, associates, Cognetti, associates and any county commissioner.
75. All records of any ex parte communication (oral or written) between any judge, hearing officer, or support master and any DRS employee, DRS attorney, or Salzmans Hughes attorney regarding any Shultz case from 2015 to present, including any communication not made in the presence of or with notice to Allen L. Shultz III or his representative.
76. All internal DRS case notes, case management entries, supervisor notes, and PACSES case log entries for every case in which Allen L. Shultz III is a party from 2015 to present,

including all entries relating to modification petitions, enforcement actions, contempt proceedings, and any notation regarding Plaintiff's disability status, SSA determination, or ADA accommodation requests.

77. All records of any meeting, conference, telephone call, or discussion between any county official, judge, DRS employee, or Salzmann Hughes attorney regarding the litigation strategy, settlement posture, or response to any filing by Allen L. Shultz III in any case from 2015 to present, including any communication regarding this Motion, the attached RTK, or any prior filing by Plaintiff. . . .

REQUEST 2

... PREFATORY STATEMENT

This Supplemental Right-to-Know Request targets a fundamental contradiction in how the Franklin County Domestic Relations Section (DRS) and its personnel are classified for purposes of insurance coverage, liability, and legal immunity.

The Pennsylvania Counties Risk Pool (PCoRP) provides insurance coverage to Franklin County under Coverage Documents #PCoRP CD01-20130601 through CD01-20230601 and all successor documents. These policies cover “all county employees acting within the scope of their duties” for Property, General Liability, Law Enforcement Liability, Automobile Insurance, Errors & Omissions Insurance, and Crime (including Employee Dishonesty/Faithful Performance at \$1,000,000 under Act 106, Computer Fraud including Fund Transfer Fraud, and Depositors Forgery).

Simultaneously, the 2025 Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement defines the DRS as “independent Parties and not as an employee or agent of the Department of Human Services” (Section 6, Attachment E). The OCSE-157 Annual Performance Report confirms that 2,032 of the 2,119 workers in Pennsylvania’s Title IV-D system (95.9%) operate under contract, interagency, or cooperative agreements — not as direct government employees. The Attorney General’s Office referred to the judicial officers and county officials as “contractors” in the cooperative agreement approval conditions.

THE QUESTION: Are the DRS personnel, hearing officers, support masters, and contracted legal services providers (including Salzmann Hughes, P.C. attorneys) classified as “county employees” under PCoRP — or are they “independent contractors” under the Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement? They cannot be both. If they are employees, judicial independence does not apply and the county bears respondeat superior liability. If they are contractors, PCoRP has been fraudulently providing coverage for non-employees, and every defense cost and claim payment is a fraudulent insurance claim. . . .

SECTION A: EMPLOYEE VS. CONTRACTOR CLASSIFICATION

01. For each individual currently employed by, contracted with, or providing services to the Franklin County Domestic Relations Section (DRS), provide the following: (a) full legal name; (b) job title or position; (c) whether classified as a county employee, independent contractor, interagency employee, or cooperative agreement worker; (d) the legal basis for that classification (statute, ordinance, contract provision, or cooperative agreement section); (e) whether covered under the PCoRP insurance policy; and (f) whether covered under any separate professional liability, malpractice, or errors and omissions policy.
02. For each DRS hearing officer and support master who has presided over any proceeding in Case Nos. 2017-1766 or 2024-3359, or any case captioned under Allen L. Shultz III or

Faith Shultz from 2015 to present: (a) full legal name; (b) whether classified as a county employee or independent contractor; (c) whether covered under PCoRP; (d) the source of their compensation (county general fund, Title IV-D reimbursement, or other); and (e) all professional liability or malpractice insurance policies covering their conduct.

03. For each attorney who has provided legal services to the DRS under the Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement from 2015 to present, including but not limited to attorneys from Salzmans Hughes, P.C., Mid-Penn Legal Services, and any individual staff attorney: (a) full legal name; (b) whether classified as a county employee or independent contractor; (c) whether covered under PCoRP; (d) whether covered under any separate professional liability or malpractice policy and the identity of that insurer; (e) the source of their compensation; and (f) a copy of any engagement letter, contract, or intergovernmental agreement governing their services.
04. All records of any determination, opinion, memorandum, or correspondence from any county official, county solicitor, PCoRP representative, or legal counsel regarding whether DRS personnel are classified as “county employees” or “independent contractors” for purposes of insurance coverage, tort liability, judicial immunity, or any other legal purpose.
05. All records of any communication between Franklin County and PCoRP regarding the classification of DRS personnel, hearing officers, support masters, or contracted legal services providers, including any request for coverage determination, any coverage dispute, and any amendment to the PCoRP policy to include or exclude such individuals.

SECTION B: PCoRP INSURANCE POLICIES AND COVERAGE DOCUMENTS

06. All PCoRP Coverage Documents, certificates of insurance, policy declarations, and coverage schedules for Franklin County from June 1, 2013 to the present, including all endorsements, amendments, riders, and supplemental coverage forms (Coverage Document numbers CD01-20130601 through CD01-20230601 and all successor documents).
07. All PCoRP coverage schedules or attachments listing covered individuals by name, title, and classification (employee or contractor) for Franklin County from 2013 to present.
08. The current PCoRP premium paid by Franklin County, broken down by coverage type (Property, General Liability, Law Enforcement Liability, Automobile, Errors & Omissions, Crime), and the premium history for each coverage year from 2013 to present.
09. All records identifying the source of funds used to pay PCoRP premiums — specifically, whether any portion of the premium is paid from Title IV-D reimbursement revenue, Title IV-D incentive payment revenue, or the Title IV-D restricted account.
10. The PCoRP Crime coverage declarations page for each coverage year from 2013 to present, showing coverage limits for Employee Dishonesty/Faithful Performance, Computer Fraud

including Fund Transfer Fraud, Depositors Forgery, and all other Crime subcategories.

SECTION C: PCoRP CLAIMS, DEFENSE COSTS, AND SETTLEMENTS

11. All claims, notices of claim, incident reports, or reservation-of-rights letters submitted to PCoRP by Franklin County or any Franklin County official relating to any Title IV-D proceeding, any domestic relations case, or any case involving Allen L. Shultz III from 2015 to present.
12. The total dollar amount of defense costs (attorney fees, expert fees, litigation expenses) paid or reimbursed by PCoRP for the defense of Franklin County, any Franklin County official, any DRS employee, any hearing officer, any support master, or any contracted legal services provider in any matter arising from Title IV-D operations from 2015 to present.
13. The total dollar amount of settlements, judgments, or indemnity payments paid by PCoRP on behalf of Franklin County or any covered individual arising from Title IV-D operations, domestic relations proceedings, or any claim by Allen L. Shultz III from 2015 to present.
14. All PCoRP defense counsel assignments for any matter involving Franklin County Title IV-D operations or any case involving Allen L. Shultz III from 2015 to present, including the name of each defense attorney or firm assigned, the dates of assignment, and the total fees paid.
15. All PCoRP claim files, investigation reports, and coverage determination letters relating to any claim arising from Franklin County Title IV-D operations or any claim by Allen L. Shultz III.
16. All records of any PCoRP coverage denial, reservation of rights, or dispute regarding whether any Franklin County DRS employee, hearing officer, support master, or contracted attorney was entitled to coverage under the PCoRP policy.
17. All PCoRP claim forms, claim filing procedures, and claim reporting requirements applicable to Franklin County, including any training materials or guidance documents provided to county officials regarding how to report claims to PCoRP.

SECTION D: LIABILITY BONDS AND SURETY

18. All official surety bonds, fidelity bonds, and faithful performance bonds held by or on behalf of any Franklin County official, employee, or contractor required to be bonded under Act 106 of 2011 or any other statute, from 2015 to present, including bonds for: each county commissioner, chief clerk, controller, treasurer, prothonotary (Tim Sponseller), sheriff (Dane Anthony, Benjamin Sites), coroner, clerk of courts, recorder of deeds (Joy Heinbaugh), register of wills, and all deputies and appointees required to receive, account for, or hold any money or property.

19. For each bond identified in Item 18: (a) the name of the surety company; (b) the bond amount; (c) the coverage period; (d) the premium paid; (e) the source of funds for the premium; and (f) whether the bond has ever been called or claimed against.
20. All surety bonds, fidelity bonds, or faithful performance bonds held by or on behalf of any DRS employee, hearing officer, support master, or contracted legal services provider from 2015 to present. If no such bonds exist, provide written confirmation that no bonds are required or held for these individuals, and identify the legal basis for that determination.
21. All records of any bond filed under the capital letter name ALLEN L. SHULTZ, ALLEN L. SHULTZ III, or any derivative thereof, held by Franklin County, the Court of Common Pleas, the DRS, or any surety company in connection with any proceeding involving Allen L. Shultz III from 2015 to present, including any bond posted in connection with child support, contempt, property seizure, sheriff sale, or any other domestic relations proceeding.
22. All records of any bond, insurance policy, indemnity agreement, or hold-harmless agreement between Franklin County and any private purchaser of property formerly owned by Allen L. Shultz III and/or Faith E. Shultz, including but not limited to Robert and Stacie Naugle, Stuart and Patricia Bishop, Grady A. Daywalt, and Joseph W. Beall.

SECTION E: PERSONAL INSURANCE POLICIES OF COUNTY ACTORS The following items request records within the county's possession or control regarding personal insurance policies of county officials and employees, to the extent such records were submitted to the county, referenced in county records, or are required disclosures under county employment or conflict-of-interest policies.

23. All records in the county's possession identifying the professional liability, malpractice, or errors and omissions insurance carriers and policy numbers for each DRS attorney, hearing officer, and support master from 2015 to present, as required to be on file with the county or the DRS as a condition of employment or contract.
24. All records in the county's possession identifying any personal liability or umbrella insurance policy of any county official named as a defendant in Case No. 2024-3359 that has been tendered for defense or indemnity in connection with this litigation or any related proceeding.
25. All records of any request by any county official or DRS employee for the county to provide defense or indemnification in connection with any claim by Allen L. Shultz III, and the county's response to each such request.

SECTION F: TITLE IV-D FUNDING OF INSURANCE PREMIUMS AND BONDS

26. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of PCoRP insurance premiums paid by Franklin County, and the percentage or dollar amount of those premiums claimed

on the Title IV-D Monthly Statement of Expenditures (MSE) as a reimbursable overhead cost.

27. For fiscal years 2015 through 2025, the total dollar amount of surety bond premiums paid by Franklin County, and the percentage or dollar amount claimed on the Title IV-D MSE.
28. All records identifying whether PCoRP insurance premiums or surety bond premiums are claimed under Budget Line 140 (Indirect Costs via CSCAP), Budget Line 117 (Repairs & Maintenance), or any other budget line on the DRS Annual Budget Plan (Cooperative Agreement Attachment B), and the federal reimbursement rate applied.
29. All records identifying whether PCoRP defense costs, settlement payments, or indemnity payments arising from Title IV-D claims are claimed on the MSE or reimbursed with Title IV-D funds. If the federal government is reimbursing 66% of the cost of defending county actors against claims arising from their own Title IV-D misconduct, identify the total federal dollars spent defending the enterprise.

SECTION G: THE CLASSIFICATION QUESTION — EMPLOYEE OR CONTRACTOR

30. A written statement from the Franklin County Solicitor identifying whether the Franklin County DRS, its hearing officers, support masters, and contracted legal services providers are classified as “county employees” or “independent contractors” for purposes of: (a) PCoRP insurance coverage; (b) tort liability and respondeat superior; (c) judicial immunity; (d) the Right-to-Know Law; (e) the Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement; and (f) federal and state tax withholding (W-2 vs. 1099). If the classification differs depending on the purpose, identify each classification and the legal authority for each.
31. All IRS Forms W-2 and/or 1099 issued by Franklin County to each DRS employee, hearing officer, support master, and contracted legal services provider from 2015 to present, or in the alternative, a statement identifying whether each individual receives a W-2 (employee) or 1099 (contractor) from the county.
32. All records of any IRS determination, audit finding, or dispute regarding the employee vs. independent contractor classification of any Franklin County DRS personnel or Title IV-D worker.
33. All records of any workers’ compensation claim filed by any DRS employee, hearing officer, support master, or contracted legal services provider through the Franklin County workers’ compensation program. If DRS personnel are covered under workers’ compensation, they are employees — not independent contractors.
34. All records of any unemployment compensation claim filed by any former DRS employee, hearing officer, support master, or contracted legal services provider through the Franklin County unemployment account. If DRS personnel are eligible for county unemployment benefits, they are employees — not independent contractors. . . .